

S P E E C H

9

DELIVERED BY

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

AT

DUBUQUE, SEPTEMBER 21, 1860.

FELLOW CITIZENS: He who could pass down the Mississippi, as it washes the shores of Iowa, and see the accumulated products of the harvest waiting, under all changes of the weather, for means of transport to the eastern markets, and thence for distribution to the needy in every part of the globe, and be unmoved, must be an enemy of his race. He who could enter this, the principal seaport of the State, witness the signs of activity and thrift which appear on all sides, ascend the hills which overlook the town and river, and see the rich and useful mineral everywhere and on every side extracted from the bosom of the earth and sent abroad to perform their part in the service of mankind, must be incapable of appreciating the elements of a great and prosperous people.

I have seen, as have my fellow travelers, this exhibition; and it may be not unpleasing to you to know the results of the observations we have made. It is that, although this town and State were stimulated to a high degree of activity, and to a very rapid process of development by the great tide of capital and emigration from the east, which was arrested in the revulsion of 1857, yet the basis of the prosperity of this city and State is sure and steadfast; the blood, after such increased activity in searching the distant parts of our great system, must needs return to the heart again in the East from which it flowed. But so long as a great nation like this remains at peace, the blood is not long in filling up again the storehouse of the heart. Within a year or two or three, the prosperity of Dubuque and of Iowa will be renewed.

Fellow citizens, we were tempted by the committee who accompanied us to the heights which overlook the city, and who took us for politicians of a different class—we were tempted with the display before us. Here, they said, at your feet lie three States, Iowa, Wisconsin and Illinois—enough, they thought, to tempt ambitious politicians as they supposed us to be. I answered that the States which were desired by Northern politicians during my connection with public service, had been no such States as these which produced wheat, and corn and lead; but they were States which lay further down the valley of the Mississippi; the nearer the Gulf of Mexico the better. And my respected friend from Massachusetts remarked that they didn't seem to know what constitutes a state in the esteem of a northern politician; it is negroes that constitute the States—politicians want slaves, and you have none to offer.

Fellow citizens, we in the East are interested in your success, in your prosperity, in your aggrandizement, for we in the East are but the consumers and the manufacturers and the sellers of what you create. We should soon languish and die if production were to cease in the valley of the Mississippi. Nor, perhaps, is it unnecessary to add, are you independent of us, for you are charged with the responsibility of supplying the materials of men and women, and of men for the defense of the liberties of this nation and its welfare. And if we of the East are feeble and imbecile, you in the West will languish and come down to the same common ruin with ourselves. It is therefore that we propose to speak to you

on this occasion of what concerns us all; a great political question, which is to be the subject of decision by the American people in the coming canvass.

We who have come here from the east say that the national policy for the last forty years on the subject has been erroneous, false, and tends to ruin, and that it must be reversed. That policy simply, tersely stated is this: *The policy of the Federal government has been to extend and fortify African slave labor in the United States.*

Now let there be no cavil on this point, for many who have maintained the administration and the party who have carried out this policy, have been unconscious, doubtless, of the nature of the policy they maintained. But it is not a subject of dispute or cavil that has been the policy of the government of the country for forty years. I will give but one illustration. No man in the nation would have objected or could have objected to the admission of Texas into the Federal Union provided it had been a free state. No man who objected could have objected but for the reason that she was not a slave state. When the question of annexing Texas tried all the existing parties, and puzzled, bewildered, and confounded the statesmen of the country, the question was finally decided, in a short and simple way, by the declaration of the administration of John Tyler, made by Mr. Calhoun, his Secretary of State, that Texas must be annexed because it was a slaveholding country—it must be annexed with the condition of subdividing it into four slave states. Texas must be annexed for the purpose of fortifying and defending the institution of slavery in the United States. This one single fact upon which the parties joined issue, is conclusive. I will not go further in showing that that has been the policy of the country for forty years.

Now I have said that it is our proposition to reverse this policy. Our policy, stated as simply as I have stated that of our adversaries, is, *to circumscribe slavery, and to fortify and extend free labor or freedom.* Many preliminary objections are raised by those among you and us, who are not prepared to go with us to the acceptance of this issue. They say that they are tired of a hobby and of men of one idea; that the country is too great a country, and has too many interests to be occupied with one idea alone; besides that it is repulsive, offensive, it is disgusting to have "this eternal negro question" forever forced upon their consideration when they desire to think of white men and other things. It is well, perhaps, to remove these preliminary objections before we go into an argument.

Now, granting for a moment that there is wisdom in the objection to entertain this eternal negro question, pray, let us ask, who raised, who has kept up this eternal negro question?

The negro question was put at rest in 1787 by the fathers of the Republic, and it slept, leaving only for moralists and humanitarians the question of emancipation, a question within the States, and by no means a federal question. Who lifted it up from the States into the area of federal politics? Who but the slaveholders, in 1820? They demanded that not only Missouri should be admitted as a slave State, located within the Louisiana purchase; but that slavery should be declared forever and was forever with

out declaration of law, established and should prevail until the end of time, in Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and in every foot of the then newly acquired domain of the United States? It was the slaveholding power who raised the negro question, and it was the Democratic party which made an alliance with that power, and which, in the North and in Congress, raised this very offensive question, this so very offensive legislation about negroes instead of legislation about white men.

The question was put at rest by the compromise of 1820, when, God be praised, Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska were saved for freedom, and only Arkansas and Missouri, out of the Louisiana purchase, surrendered to slavery; and it slept again for fifteen or twenty years, and then the negro question was again introduced into the councils of the federal government,—and by whom? By the slave power, when it said that "since you have taken Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska, and left us only Missouri, Arkansas and Florida, out of our newly acquired possessions, you must now go on and annex Texas, so that we shall have a balance and counterpoise in this government." Then the Democratic party again were seized with a sudden desire to extend the area of slavery along the Gulf of Mexico; and by way of balancing the triumph of liberty so as to put manacles and chains on the claws of the conquering eagle of the country!

Who, then, is responsible for the eternal negro question? Still such was the forbearance, the patience, the hope without reason and without justice, of the friends of freedom throughout the United States, that the eternal negro question would have been at rest then, if it had not again been brought forward into the federal councils in the years 1848 and 1850, when the slave power forced us into a war with Mexico by which we acquired Upper California and New Mexico, and for no other purpose but that, notwithstanding all the advantages which slavery had gained since the Atlantic States were free, now, as a balance, slavery must have the Pacific coast, and so keep up the equilibrium (according to the notions of Mr. Calhoun) between free labor and slave labor or between freedom and slavery in the United States.

Thus, on these three different occasions, when the public mind was at rest on the subject of the negro, the slave power forced it upon public consideration and demanded aggressive action. When they had at last secured the consent of the people of the free States to a compromise in 1850, by which it was agreed that California alone might be free, and that New Mexico should be remanded back into a territorial condition because she had not established slavery—then there was but one man in the United States Senate that would vote to accept New Mexico as a Free State when she came with her constitution in her hands; and that man the humble individual who stands before you: [Cheers.] Aye, you applaud me for it now; but where were your votes in 1850? All well; it is all past.

When they had agreed on a compromise, and had driven out of the federal councils every man but myself and some half dozen other representatives who had opposed the aggressions of slavery, were they content to let the negro question rest? No, but in 1854 the Democracy raised the negro question to force it finally and forever

throughout the whole Republic, by abrogating the Missouri Compromise. They abandoned the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska to slave labor, and actually assisted and encouraged the armies sent there by the slaveholders, to take forcible possession of territory which, until then, had been free.

O! what pleasure shall I have, in telling the people of Kansas, three days hence, how that, when all others were faithless and false and timid, they renewed this battle, this standard of freedom, and expelled the intruding slaveholder, and established forever amongst themselves the freedom of labor and the freedom of men on the plains of Kansas.

Were the Democracy then content? Not at all; but they determined, in 1858, to raise the negro question once more and to admit Kansas into the Union, if she would have come in as a Slave State, and to keep her out indefinitely if she should elect freedom.

And only one year later, when they found that Kansas was slipping from their clutches, who then raised once more the eternal negro question? The slave power and the Administration took it up by demanding the annexation of Cuba, a slaveholding island of Spain, to be acquired at a cost of \$150,000,000, peaceably, if it could be obtained for that sum, and forcibly if it should not be surrendered, for the purpose of adding two slave states, well manned and well appointed, to balance the votes of Kansas and Minnesota, then expected to come into the Union as free states.

Who has brought this issue and entered it on the record of Kansas? The slaveholding party—the Democratic party. They held their Convention first in this campaign at Charleston. They presented again the everlasting negro question, nothing more, nothing less. They differed about the form, but they gave us, nevertheless, the everlasting negro question in two different parts, giving us our choice to take one or the other, as they gave the people of Kansas the choice, whether they would take slavery pure and simple, or take it anyhow and get rid of it afterwards if they could.

Of one part, Mr. Breckinridge is the representative. It is presented plain and distinct; it is that slaves are merchandise and property in the territories under the Constitution of the United States, and that the national legislatures and the courts must protect it in the territories, and no power on earth can discharge them of the responsibility. Of the other, Mr. Douglas is the representative, and the form in which it is presented by those who support him is, What is the best way not to keep slavery out of the territories?

I doubt very much whether slaveholders have a great repugnance to the negro and to the eternal negro question as they affect. On the other hand, being accustomed to set in the Federal councils, with grave and reverend Senators, and to mingle with representatives of the people from slaveholding States, I find a great difference between myself and them on the subject. God knows, I never would consent to be the unbidden, the unchosen Representative of bondmen! They must be freemen that I represent; every man of them must be a whole man. But my respected friends who represent the slave States are willing, and do most cheerfully, most gladly

consent to represent three-fifths of all the negro slaves. They take a slave at three-fifths of a man, and they represent the three-fifths; I doubt not they would be very glad if he could be created into five-fifths.

Well, I think the Democratic party has not so much repugnance to negroes and the negro question, because they consent to take offices of President, Vice-President, Secretary of State, Ministers to Bogota, and to all other parts of the world, Consulships, and post offices, that are derived indirectly by adding another link to the chain of States in which negroes count each one, three-fifths. No, no; slaveholders and the Democratic party would be very glad to take votes from negroes, free or slave, by the head, full count, if negroes and slaves would only vote for Slavery; and it is only because they have a sagacious insight into human nature, which teaches them that negroes and slaves would vote for liberty, that makes the negro question so repulsive to them.

But, fellow citizens, is this one idea, the eternal negro question, so objectionable merely on account of the negro? I think not: I think it far otherwise; for, after all, you see that the negro has the least of everybody else in the world, to do with it. The negro is no party to it; he is only an incident; he is a subject of disputes, but not one of the litigants. He has just as much to do with it as a horse or a watch in a justice's court, when two neighbors are litigating about its ownership. The horse question or watch question is excellent business for the justice, and lawyers to make fees, and for the neighbors generally to get fun out of; and my friend General Nye was never so happy in his life as when attending suits before justices of the peace, settling this eternal horse question and watch question. (Laughter.)

The controversy is not with the negro at all, but with two classes of white men, one who has a monopoly of negroes, and the other who has no negroes. One is an aristocratic class, that wants to extend itself over the new territories and so retain the power it already exercises; and the other is yourselves, my good friends, men who have no negroes and won't have any, and who mean that the aristocratic system shall not be extended. There is no negro question about it at all. It is an eternal question between classes—between the few privileged and the many unprivileged—the eternal question between aristocracy and democracy.

A sorrowful world this will be when that question shall be put to rest; for when it is, the rest that it shall have, shall be the same it has always had for six thousand years; the riding of the privileged over the necks of the unprivileged, booted and spurred. And the nation that is willing to establish such an aristocracy, and is shamed out of the defense of its own rights, deserves no better fate than that which befalls the timid, the cowardly and the unworthy.

It is to-day in the United States the same question that is filling Hungary, and is lifting the throne of a Caesar of Austria from its pedestals; the same which has expelled the tyrant of Naples from the beautiful Sicily, and has driven him from his palace at Naples to seek shelter in his fortress at Gaeta. It is not only an eternal question, but it is a universal question. Every man from a foreign land will find here in Ame-

rien, in another form, the *irrepressible conflict* [Applause], which crushed him out, an exile from his native land.

Again, fellow citizens, I am not quite convinced that it is sound philosophy in anything, at least in politics, to banish the principle of giving paramount importance at any one time to one idea. If a man wishes to secure a good crop of wheat to pay off the debt he owes upon his land, he is seized with one idea in the spring; he plows, plants and sows; he gathers and reaps, with a single leading idea of getting forty bushels to the acre, if he can. If a merchant wishes to be successful, he surrenders himself to the one idea of buying as cheap, and selling as dear as he honestly can. I would not give much for a lawyer who is put in charge of my case, that would suffer himself, when before the jury, to be distracted with a great many pleasing ideas. I want one devoted to my cause. In the church we have a great many clergymen who have a horror of this one idea and the negro question, but I think it was St. Peter who had it made known to him in a vision on the housetop, that he must not have scattered ideas; but there was to be but one idea only, that is of being satisfied with everything else provided he could only win souls to his Master. And Paul was very much after this spirit; he said he would be all things to all men, provided he could save some souls.

There was in the Revolution one man seized with a terrible fanaticism, propelled by one idea. He scattered terror all through this continent; and when he passed from Boston to the first Congress in Philadelphia, deputations from New York and Philadelphia went out to meet this man of one idea, and that of national independence. And still John Adams proved, after all, to be a public benefactor. There was, during the Revolution, another man of one idea that appeared to burn in him so ardently that he was regarded as the most dangerous man on the continent; and a triple reward was offered for his head. He actually went so far as to take all the men of one idea in the country, and suffer himself to take command of them. That man was George Washington. His idea was justice, political justice. There was another monomaniac of the same kind down in Virginia; he, at the close of the Revolution, had one idea, an eternal idea, and it even included negroes, and that was the idea of equality. It was Thomas Jefferson. Now, though the State which reared him might be glad if it could erase from his monument at Mount Vernon its sublime inscription, yet the world can never lose that proud and beautiful epitaph, written by himself: "Here lies Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence."

About the year 1803 or 1804, the French Secretary for Foreign Affairs gave a dinner to the American representatives at Court, and to American citizens resident there; and there was a large and various party. When the wine flowed freely, and conversation ought to have been general, there was one young man who was possessed with one idea, and he could not rest, but kept continually putting his idea before the minister and the feet of the guests, saying, "If you only make up for me a sum of, or show me a boat that will lead me five thousand dollars, I will put a knot on the Hudson river which will make the passage from New York to Albany a few miles

an hour, without being driven by oars or sails." He was an offensive monomaniac, that Robert Fulton. But still had it not been for his one idea, Iowa would have slept the last sixty years, and down to the twentieth century, and not one human being before me or within the boundaries of this State would have resided here. What I understand by one idea is this: It is simply means that a man, or a people, or a State, is in earnest. They get an idea which they think is useful, and they are in earnest. God save us when we are to abandon confidence in earnest men and take to following trivial men of light minds, confused and scattered ideas, and weak purposes.

Fellow citizens, there is no such thing as government carried out without the intervention, the rising, the exaltation of one idea, and without the activity, guidance and influence of earnest men. You may be listless, indifferent, indolent, each one of you; do you therefore get other people to go to sleep? No. You go to sleep, and you will find somebody that has got one idea that you don't like, who will be wide awake. They want to be wide awake on the negro question as long as it pays, and it pays just as long as you will be content to follow their guidance and take several ideas.

Fellow citizens, industry is the result of one idea. I have never heard of idle ones in the beaver's camp, but I do know there are drones in the beehive. Nevertheless, the beaver's camp and the beehive all give evidence of the domination of one idea. The Almighty Power himself could never have made the world, and never govern it, if he had not bent the force and application of the one idea to make it perfect. And when at 7 o'clock in the morning, three months ago, with the almanac in my hand, I stood with my smoked glass between me and the sun to see whether the almanac maker was correct or whether nature vacillated between one idea and another, I was astonished to see that, at the very second of time indicated by the astronomer, the shadow of the moon entered the disk of the sun. There was one idea, six in the mind of the Omnipotent Creator that, only thousand, or ten thousand, or twenty thousand, or hundreds of thousands of years ago, set that sun, that moon, and this earth in their places, and subjected them to laws which brought that shadow exactly at this point at that instant of time. Earth is serious; heaven is serious; earth is earnest; heaven is earnest. There is no place for men of scattered and confused ideas in the earth below, or in the heavens above, whatever there may be in place under the earth.

Every one idea has its negative. It has its destinies, its purpose, and it has its negative. So it is with the idea of slavery; it means nothing less, nothing more, nothing different from the extension of commerce and trading to slave lands. In our national system it means the extension of commerce in slave lands to regions where that commerce has no right to exist. The negative of it is our right which we are endeavoring to maintain by your minds, opposition to trading in slaves within those portions of the territory where slaves are not lawfully a subject of exchange. To establish a national edifice on a base of compromise of 1820 the Democratic party say for the sake of men, and their opponents, Rufus King, John W. Caldwell, and others in Congress, say that there are

an irrepressible conflict between the two ideas of slavery and freedom, or rather between the two sides of one idea. The alternative offered to the Democracy and to all the people of the United States, was a plain one;—the slaveholders are strong, are united; there are many slave States and they are agreed in their policy there are as many free States, but they are divided in opinion. Lend your support to the slave States and you shall have the power, patronage, honors and glory of administering the government of the United States. Some asked, for how long? Wise men cast the horoscope and said forty years: just about that time an infant State shall grow up north of Missouri within the Louisiana purchase, and another shall grow up in Kansas. These forty years the great men I have named seemed few and feeble in numbers; still we would rather have quiet consciences during all the time and postpone honors and rewards for forty years, rather than to take the side of slavery; and the Democratic party reasoning otherwise, said, "Give us the offices and power now: we will hold it the forty years and more if we can."

They say that the "old one" is inexorable; that when he makes a bond he lives up to it, but when the time is up he calls for his own. To Mr. Breckinridge, Mr. Douglas, slave States and all, he says: "I have given you all the rope that was allowed me to give you, now you must go."

This, my young friends, for I see many such around me, brings me to a point where I can give you one instruction which, if you practice as long as you live, may make at least some of you great men, honorable men, useful men. Remember that all questions have two sides; one is the right side, and the other the wrong side; one is the side of justice, the other that of injustice; one the side of human nature, the other of crime. If you take the right side, the just side, ultimately men, however much they may oppose you and revile you, will come to your support; earth with all its powers will work with you and for you, and Heaven is pledged to conduct you to complete success. If you take the other side, there is no power in earth or heaven that can lead you through successfully, because it is appointed in the councils of heaven that justice, truth and reason alone can prevail. This instruction would be incomplete if I were not to add one other, that indifference between right and wrong is nothing else than taking the wrong side. The policy of a great leader of the Democratic party in the North is indifference; it is nothing to him whether slavery is voted up or voted down in the Territories. Thus it makes no difference to that distinguished statesman whether slavery is voted up or voted down in the new States; whether they all become slave States or free States.

Let us see how this would have worked in the revolution. If Jefferson had been indifferent as to whether Congress voted up the Declaration of Independence or voted it down, what kind of a man would they have had with it. Patrick Henry would have been after him with a vigilance committee, and he would have no monument over his remains. The British Government would have liked nothing better than a lot of such indifferent men for leaders of the American people, and George the Third and his dynasty might

have had rule over this continent for a thousand years to come.

I have thus removed the preliminary objection always interposed on these occasions against the indulgence of the eternal negro question. What is the just and right national policy with regard to slavery in the territories and in the new states of the Federal Union? and your decision of that subject will involve the consideration of what you consider to be the national constituents of a state.

I suppose I may infer from your choosing this beautiful land on the western bank of Mississippi that you all want to make Iowa a great and good state, a flourishing and prosperous state. You consider the development of the latent resources with which nature has supplied the region on which you build a state, as one of the material things to be considered in building up a great state; that is to say, you will have the forests subjugated and make them contribute the timber and lumber for the house, for the city, for the wharf, for the steamer, for the ship of war, and for all the purposes of civilized society. Then I think you will consider that if the land has concealed within it, deposits of iron, or lead, or coal, you will think of getting this out as rapidly as you can, so as to increase the public wealth. Then I think that you will have the same idea about states everywhere else that you have about Iowa; and that your first idea about the way to make a state corresponds with my idea to make a great nation. And as you would subdue the forests, would develop the lead, iron and coal in your region; as you would improve the fields, putting ten oxen to a plow to turn up the prairie, and then plant it with wheat and corn; as you would encourage manufactures, and try, by making railways and telegraphs, to facilitate interchange of products; it is exactly this I propose to do for every new state like Iowa, that is to be admitted into the Federal Union. To be sure we shall leave the slave states, which are all in the Union, as they are; our responsibilities are limited to the states which are yet to come into the Union, and we will apply our system to them. The first question then, in making a state, is to favor the industry of the people, and industry is favored in every land exactly as it is free and uncrippled.

We are a great nation; we have illimitable forests in the far East and on the banks of the upper waters of the Mississippi, around the lakes and on the Pacific coast. No human arithmetic could compute the amount of materials of the forest that have gone into the aggregate of the wealth which this nation possesses. At this day there is not one foot of timber, not one foot of dealboards, not a lath, not a shingle, entering into the commerce of the United States that is fabricated by a slave.

You all have an idea, or had in the land from which you came here, of the value and importance of the fisheries, of making the ocean surrender its treasures to increase the national wealth. The fisherman is seen in the winter time fishing for ice in the ponds and lakes of Massachusetts; and if you go to Palestine or to Grand Cairo or to the furthest Indies, you will find yourself regaled with ice fished out of the lakes and ponds of Massachusetts. But ice is not a product that goes far to the support of human life;

but can you tell me what portions of the earth are lighted on their way by night, at home in their cities, by the produce of their fisheries? Have you any idea of how much the great machinery of the country engaged in fabrication of goods and in navigation is indebted to the fisheries? Those of the United States are a great source of national wealth; and a nursery of seamen for the commercial marine and naval service of the United States, indispensable for the development of the resources of a great people. There is not now and there never was a lake or river, sea or bay, over the whole world, from the Arctic to the Antarctic pole, a negro slave fisherman.

You have been very indifferent about these subjects: you have not taken notice of that. It was only two years ago, only by constant watchfulness and activity of the friendly representatives of the free States in Congress, that the whole protection of the United States was not withdrawn from the fisheries. The slaveholders don't want ice to be gathered with free soil hands; they would rather have it taken from the lakes and rivers of Russia. They don't want the fisheries conducted by free hands; they would rather take their supplies from foreign markets. The fisheries are somewhat foreign for you, but the quarries are not—the granite and the marble out of which our capitol is being constructed, our great cities erected, some of it in your own beautiful city. Have you any idea of how large a portion of the national wealth is extracted from the quarries of granite and marble and free stone? It is beyond any arithmetic to compute. Yet there is not a slave engaged in a quarry in the United States. Have you any slaves down your shafts in your lead mines here? Not one. Have you any slaves in your coal mines? Not one. Any in your iron mines? Not one. Pennsylvania is being burrowed all through and through in all directions, and the iron and coal, taken out and fabricated. There is not a single slave, nor was there ever one, that raised his hand to add to that supply of national wealth.

On the other hand you have in Maryland and in Virginia deposits of coal and iron as rich, ay, and of gold too; and yet in Maryland and Virginia in their iron, coal, and silver mines, the work is mainly done by freemen.

I need not speak of manufactures; the African slave is reduced to a brute, as nearly as may be, and he is incompetent to weave, to cast a shuttle, to turn a wheel, to grease or oil a wheel and keep it in motion. In all the vast manufacturing establishments in the United States; in all the establishments of the forests and of the fisheries, or of manufactures throughout the whole world, there is not one African slave to be found. California rejected the labor of slaves, and well she did so; for if she had invited and courted it, her mines, instead of yielding fifty millions of gold per year to the commerce of the United States, would be yielding nothing.

Could a man subsist in Iowa by cultivating wheat or corn with slave labor? If not they tell us this is a question altogether of economy, and that men have no idea of justice. No man has ever brought or ever thinks of bringing an African slave here; the reason is a moral one; that slave labor don't pay, and only free labor will.

Commerce is of two kinds, domestic and foreign. The commerce down the Mississippi and

up, the commerce across the railroads with New York, is domestic commerce; the commerce across the ocean with foreign nations, is the foreign commerce. In New Orleans I found that sixteen thousand men were engaged in domestic trading on the river between New Orleans and the up country in the Mississippi valley. How many of them were slaves? Not one. Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, New York, Michigan, send the boatmen who conduct the commerce even in slave States, while on all the oceans there is not a slave engaged in commerce.

Now the three great wheels of national wealth are agriculture, including the subjugation of the forests, manufactures and trade. Slaves are unfit, African slaves are absolutely unfit to be employed in turning either of those wheels; and it thus enters into the elements of a great and prosperous state that its people shall not be slaves but freemen.

The reason is obvious; it is the interest of the freeman to cultivate himself as well as he can, to produce the most he can, at the least cost; and it is the interest of the slave to be as disqualified as he can, to consume as much as he can, and produce as little more than he consumes as possible.

It is not wealth alone that makes a nation; it must have strength and power to command, by the mere signification of its will, peace and good order at home and respect and confidence abroad. Just imagine the United States converted into planting States in which the labor was performed only by negro slaves, and judge, if you can, what would be the police power of the government in any of the States. The laborer in a slave State is watched night and morning; his outgoings, his incomings, his path is surrounded by a police; he can pass to execute the order of his master only on a permit or license. Why, he must retire to sleep at nine or ten at night, and must not be abroad from the plantation without a special license, for no other reason than, being held in involuntary bondage, his master regards him as an enemy to be watched.

Turn a whole nation into masters watching slaves, and slaves regarded as natural enemies—what is the power of that nation to preserve peace at home? What its power to command respect abroad? Make us for once a nation of slave States, and any feeble, worthless power in Europe has only to apply the torch of insurrection and civil war by proposing to emancipate our slaves; instead of relying on ourselves we would want to make a federal union with Canada that we might get protection, just as the free States now protect the slave States.

But all these—material wealth and power—are but low ideas of what constitute a nation. It should have a head, an enlightened head; an open, free, manly, honest heart. Such will enable any man or woman to go through the world with safety. A nation is only an aggregate of individuals, of so many heads to work as one head; of so many hearts to work as one heart. You want an enlightened free people to constitute a nation; and if you have such a people, they are perpetually reducing the labor, the sacrifice, and toll of muscle; and if it be true, as theologians say, that labor is the primal curse imposed by the Maker on man for disobedience, then this benevolent heart and enlightened head will suggest all manner of machines to relieve

them of the necessity of so much labor. The poor widow, who, to eke out a subsistence, has to sew for her neighbors, with a machine that costs but from fifty to one hundred dollars—the invention of a free people—make fifty garments where before she made but one. And the steam engine—it plows, plants, sows and harvests; it threshes, it gathers into the granaries; it hauls the cars loaded with produce; it drives the steamboat on the river. That is what invention does. Now, out of the million inventions which the American people enjoy, there is not one that was made by a slave, and simply because the slave is imbruted in his heart and stultified in his intellect.

A nation to be great wants character—character for justice, honesty, integrity; for ability to maintain its own rights and respect for the rights of others. That it cannot have if it be a nation of slaves. It is only a nation of freemen that can cultivate the virtues which constitute a character. These virtues are two: Justice, equal and exact justice among men; the equal freedom and liberty of every other man. The other virtue is courage. The freeman has no enemies; he is just; he oppresses nobody; nobody wishes to be revenged upon him. A nation of freemen are safe; they provoke nobody; they wrong nobody; they covet nothing; they keep the tenth commandment. And nations must keep the commandments as well as individuals, or suffer the same penalty.

But you cannot have these virtues except on one condition, and that is that the people of the nation are trained up in them. And how trained? By schools and general instruction, free press, free debate at home, and in legislative councils; and everywhere to be undisturbed as they go in and come out. Introduce slavery in Iowa, and what kind of freedom of speech would you enjoy? What kind of freedom of the press? freedom of bridges? of taverns? Just look across the State of Missouri into Kansas, and you will find freedom of the press provided you will maintain that property is above labor, that slavery is before all constitutions and governments—the freedom of speech which sought the expulsion of John Quincy Adams from the Congress of the United States, for presenting a petition in favor of human rights; the freedom of debate which arrested my distinguished and esteemed friend, Charles Sumner, in the midst of a glorious and useful career, and doomed him to wander a sufferer and invalid for four years. As for freedom of bridges, why the bridge over the Missouri at Kansas was proved to be only a bridge for slave State men; and the tavern at Lawrence was subverted for a nuisance on account of its being a tavern at which free State men could stop.

It is a bright September afternoon, and a strange feeling of surprise comes over me that I should be here in the State of Iowa, the State redeemed and saved in the compromise of 1820; a State peopled by freemen; that I should be there in such a State, before such a people, exploring the citizens of Iowa to maintain the cause of Freedom instead of the cause of Slavery. It is a strange change from the position I was in only a year ago. In Italy, in Austria, in Turkey even, I was excusing, in the best way I could, the monstrous delinquencies of the American people in tolerating slavery, which even the

Turk had abrogated. You tell me that it is unnecessary; that you are all right; I happen to know better. That courtesy which I appreciate, suavity which I acknowledge, restricts some, many in this assembly from interrupting these remarks (though they are intended to be disrespectful to nobody) as I have often been interrupted, with shouts of—"Hurrah for Douglas;" and yet, if I am right in what I have said, the Wide-Awakes are not up an hour too soon; they do not sit up any too late o' nights; their zeal is not a bit too strong to save the State of Iowa from giving her votes, in the present canvass, for a continuance of that administration which has for forty years made slavery the cardinal institution, and freedom secondary to it in the United States. There is something of excuse and apology for this; it is in the reluctance which men who are always opposed to one new idea coming in, have to give up the old idea, which they have so long cherished. The Democratic party has a wonderful affection for the name; the *prestige* of the Democratic party; and most of them, fellow citizens, must die unconverted. It is not in human nature that adult men and women change their opinions with facility; it is little ones like these that grow up unobserved and unknown. Ten thousand of their votes enter into every successive canvass in the State of Iowa.

In every State the great reformation which has been made within the last six years—for we date no further back than that—has been the dying out of the one idea men of Democracy and the growing up of the young one—idea men of Republicanism. And now why shall we not insist, so far as our votes shall be effective, that the Territories shall remain free Territories, so that new States which shall hereafter be added to this Union shall be free States.

They say we have no right to interfere in the slave States; that we attack slavery in them. Not at all; we do not vote against slavery in Virginia. We do not authorize Abraham Lincoln or the Congress of the United States to pass any laws about slavery in Virginia. We merely authorize them to intervene in the Territories, and to pass laws securing freedom there. They tell us that it is unnecessary. They have rendered it necessary, because they have explained the laws and the constitution to establish slavery there, and we must either restrict slavery there or reverse the decision made by the federal tribunal. But they tell us that this is inconvenient; it excites violence in the slave States. To which I answer that they have the choice between slavery and freedom as well as we; but they must be content to leave it where it is. When they choose to carry slaves into the Territories we interfere. What we are attacking is not slavery in the United States but slavery in the Territories.

But they tell us that we are suffering very great harm; that our Southern friends, driven angry, will not buy of us. Mayor Wood made the discovery that we are a trading people, and we shall lose our trade if the Republican party come into power. We are a trading people as we are an eating people, a drinking people, a clothes wearing people. Trade! trade! trade! the great character, the great employment, the one idea of the American people! It is a libel. We buy only with what we produce. We buy

and sell; but that is merely incidental to our greater occupation of producing and making; and even these are subordinate to our great notion of educating and cultivating ourselves to make a great, virtuous and happy people. Trade, however, for those who engage in it, knows no respect of opinion; the Southern planters will buy their cotton bagging of the men who will make it the cheapest, and they will insist on selling cotton to the Castle Garden committees and the Cooper Institute patriots at precisely the same price as they will to Wendell Phillips and Frederick Douglas. They won't buy your wheat unless hungry for bread; and if hungry for bread they will gladly give you for it any surplus of cotton you want. (Laughter.)

Fellow citizens, I have refrained from advertising to the higher sentiments of humanity which enter into the consideration of this subject, because those are considerations that are always

with you. I will now say that the suggestions of justice are always in harmony with the suggestions and impulses of humanity, and both spring from the same source. Nature herself seems to be forbearing; she seems passive and silent. She lets nations as she lets individuals go on in their course of action violating her laws; but this is for a season. The time comes at last when Nature herself vindicates every right, and punishes every wrong of the actions of men or states; and when that does come, we are punished. She comes in fire, in revolution, in anarchy, in chaos, and will let this government and this nation go down still further the smooth delivry if we choose; nature will bring it back again in time with convulsions which will wake the groans and groans of the civilized world. (Loud applause.)

16